20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO 1 A Professional Corporation Steven D. Atkinson State Bar No. 59094 2 State Bar No. 135398 Mark T. Palin Christopher S. Milligan 17871 Park Plaza Drive State Bar No. 211532 3 Cerritos, California 90703-8597 4 Telephone: (562) 653-3200 • (714) 826-5480 Facsimile: (562) 653-3333 5 Attorneys for Defendants CBC 6 FRAMING, INC. and JOHN VOJTECH 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 10

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JESUS MARTINEZ MENDOZA JAVIER CABRERA, AURELIANO FLORES, Plaintiffs,

VS.

JOHN W. VOJTECH, CBC FRAMING, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION AND DOES 1-10,

Defendant.

CASE NO.:

CV 08-01675 HRL

DEFENDANT JOHN W. VOJTECH'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW Defendant JOHN W. VOJTECH ("Defendant"), erroneously sued herein as JOHN W. VOJTECH, dba CBC FRAMING, INC., answering for himself and no other party to Plaintiffs JESUS MARTINEZ MENDOZA, JAVIER CABRERA, and AURELIANO FLORES's ("Plaintiff") Complaint for Damages (the "Complaint") as follows:

NATURE OF CLAIM

Answering this initial paragraph, Defendant denies that Plaintiffs are owed overtime under either the Fair Labor Standards Act or the California Wage Orders and statutes, or that he is liable for any unpaid wages, damages, liquidated

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

damages, penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, prejudgment interest and/or restitution to Plaintiffs. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

PARTIES

- 1. Answering paragraph 1 of the Complaint, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 1, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 2 of the Complaint, Defendant lacks sufficient 2. information and belief to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 1, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 3 of the Complaint, Defendant lacks sufficient 3. information and belief to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 1, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 4 of the Complaint, Defendant lacks sufficient 4. information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 5 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges he is President of CBC Framing, Inc. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
 - 6. Answering paragraph 6 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that he is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

President of CBC Framing, Inc. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

VENUE

Answering paragraph 7 of the Complaint, Defendant lacks sufficient 7. information and belief to admit or deny the allegations contained in paragraph 7, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 8. Answering paragraph 8 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that Plaintiffs are former employees of Defendant CBC Framing, Inc. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 9 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both 9. generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 10. Answering paragraph 10 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 11. Answering paragraph 11 of the Complaint, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 12 of the Complaint, Defendant lacks sufficient 12. information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

AININDON, ANDELSON, LOTA, KUUD & KOMO

22

25 26

27

28

COUNT ONE: VIOLATION OF CA LABOR CODE SECTION § 510 FAILURE TO PROPERLY PAY OVERTIME WAGES

- Answering paragraph 13 of the Complaint, Defendant makes 13. reference to all of its prior answers to each and every paragraph incorporated by reference in paragraph 13 of the Complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein as though set forth in full.
- Answering paragraph 14 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 14. Labor Code § 501 [sic] speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 15 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both 15. generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 16 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 16. Labor Code § 1194 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 17 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both 17. generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 18. Answering paragraph 18 of the Complaint, Defendant denies that he owes Plaintiffs any unpaid wages. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
 - 19. Answering paragraph 19 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their respective contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

Answering paragraph 20 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 20. Labor Code § 1194 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents. Defendant further denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to attorneys' fees and/or costs in this action. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

COUNT TWO: VIOLATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT FAILURE TO PROPERLY PAY OVERTIME WAGES

- Answering paragraph 21 of the Complaint, Defendant makes 21. reference to all of its prior answers to each and every paragraph incorporated by reference in paragraph 21 of the Complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein as though set forth in full.
- Answering paragraph 22 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their respective contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 23 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 29 U.S.C. § 207, speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said

paragraph.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Answering paragraph 24 of the Complaint, Defendant denies that 24. Plaintiffs regularly worked in excess of forty hours per week or that he owes Plaintiffs any alleged unpaid wages. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 25 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both 25. generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 26. Answering paragraph 26 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 27. Answering paragraph 27 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 28 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both 28. generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 29 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 29 29. U.S.C. § 216(b), speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

COUNT THREE: VIOLAITON [SIC] OF CA LABOR **CODE SECTION 201**

FAILURE TO PAY WAGES DUE AND "WAITING TIME" PENALTIES

Answering paragraph 30 of the Complaint, Defendant makes 30. reference to all of its prior answers to each and every paragraph incorporated by reference in paragraph 30 of the Complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein as though set forth in full.

AININDON, ANDELDON, LOTA, KUUD & KOMO

11

13 14

16

18

19

21

20

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

- 31. Answering paragraph 31 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 32 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 32. Labor Code §§ 201 and 203, speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their respective contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 33 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both 33. generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 34 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 34. Labor Code § 218.5 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 35 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 35. Labor Code § 218.6 speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents. Defendant further denies that Plaintiffs are owed any alleged unpaid wages and therefore denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of interest. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

COUNT FOUR: VIOLATION OF CA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES

- Answering paragraph 36 of the Complaint, Defendant makes 36. reference to all of its prior answers to each and every paragraph incorporated by reference in paragraph 36 of the Complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein as though set forth in full.
- Answering paragraph 37 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that the 37. Labor Code and Wage Orders speak for themselves and are the best evidence of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

21

27

their respective contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

- Answering paragraph 38 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that the 38. California Unfair Trade Practices Act (California Business and Professions Code § 17000, et seq.), speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their respective contents. Defendant further denies that he owes Plaintiffs any alleged unpaid wages. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 39. Answering paragraph 39 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 40. Answering paragraph 40 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that the California Unfair Trade Practices Act (California Business and Professions Code § 17000, et seq.), speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their respective contents. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 41 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both 41. generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 42 of the Complaint, Defendant denies that he 42. owes Plaintiffs any alleged unpaid wages. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 43. Answering paragraph 43 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that California Business and Professions Code § 17203, speaks for itself and is the best

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

COUNT FIVE: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 226 **INADEQUATE PAY STATEMENTS**

- Answering paragraph 44 of the Complaint, Defendant makes 44. reference to all of its prior answers to each and every paragraph incorporated by reference in paragraph 44 of the Complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein as though set forth in full.
- Answering paragraph 45 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 45. California Labor Code § 226, speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient contents. information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- Answering paragraph 46 of the Complaint, Defendant alleges that 46. California Labor Code § 226, speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient contents. information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 47. Answering paragraph 47 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 48. Answering paragraph 48 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.
- 49. Answering paragraph 49 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Answering paragraph 50 of the Complaint, Defendant denies both 50. generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

Answering paragraph 51 the Complaint, Defendant alleges that Labor 51. Code § 226eaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents. Defendant further denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to attorneys' fees and/or costs in this action. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant lacks sufficient information and belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis, denies both generally and specifically the allegations contained in said paragraph.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Defendant is informed and believes and based thereon alleges as follows:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Complaint, and its purported claims for relief, fails to state facts 1. sufficient to constitute a claim for relief against Defendant.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

2. Defendant cannot be held individually liable for any alleged unpaid wages and/or penalties, as he was not Plaintiffs' employer.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

3. Defendant cannot be held individually liable for any alleged unpaid wages and/or penalties, as he is not an alter-ego of Defendant CBC Framing, Inc.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Court lacks jurisdiction over the claims alleged in the Complaint 4. or some of the claims alleged in the Complaint.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrines of exhaustion, abstention 5. and/or primary jurisdiction in that Plaintiffs have not exhausted their available administrative remedies.

009318.00011/125956v1

4

5

3

6 7

8

11

10

12 13

16

17 18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

6. To each claim for relief in the Complaint, Defendant alleges that recovery thereon is barred or diminished by reason of Plaintiffs' failure to mitigate their alleged damages.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

7. Plaintiffs' claims for "waiting time" penalties under <u>Labor Code</u> §§ 201-203 are barred because Defendant had a good faith belief that no such wages were owed and that all wages were properly paid.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

8. Plaintiffs' claims for "waiting time" penalties under <u>Labor Code</u> §§ 201-203 must fail because Defendant has not "willfully failed" to pay wages to Plaintiff.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

9. Plaintiffs' claim for penalties under <u>Labor Code</u> § 226 is barred because Defendant did not "knowingly and intentionally" fail to comply with its requirements.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

10. Plaintiffs lack standing to assert any of the claims in their Complaint.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

11. The claims alleged in the Complaint against Defendant are barred in that Plaintiffs ratified by their conduct that all wages due were paid.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

12. Plaintiffs' actions constitute a total release and waiver of any and all claims which may have existed against Defendant.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

13. Plaintiffs, by reason of their acts, omissions, representations and courses of conduct by which Defendant was led to rely to its detriment, are barred from any recovery herein by virtue of the doctrine of estoppel.

11

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
17871 PARK PLAJA DRIVE
CERRIOS, CALIFORNIA 90703-8597
TELEPHONE: (562) 653-3200 • (714) 826-5480

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

14. Plaintiffs, by reason of their acts, omissions, representations and courses of conduct which indicate a waiver of any claims against Defendant, is barred from any recovery herein by the doctrine of waiver.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

15. If any equitable relief is claimed to be owed to the Plaintiffs as a result of the Complaint on file herein, it is barred as a result of the doctrine of laches.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

16. Plaintiffs would be unjustly enriched if they recovered any sums alleged in their Complaint.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

17. The obligations set forth in Plaintiffs' Complaint were fully discharged by Defendant's payment to Plaintiffs of all wages due and were accepted by Plaintiffs in full payment of the obligation.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

18. The Complaint and each and every claim for relief alleged therein is barred by all applicable statutes of limitation, including, but by no means limited to CCP §§ 337-343 and/or <u>Business and Professions Code</u> § 17208.

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

19. Should Plaintiffs recover damages from Defendant, Defendant is entitled to indemnification in whole or in part from all persons or entities whose conduct and/or fault proximately contributed to Plaintiffs' damages, if any.

TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

20. Defendant is informed, believes, and on that basis alleges that Plaintiffs agreed to accept and did in fact accept something different or less than that to which they claimed they were entitled to and thereby extinguished their original claim. Such conduct bars them from any recovery herein under the

-12-

3 4

5 6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13

14

AININDON, ANDELDON, LOTA, KUUD & KUMO

15

16

17 18 19

> 20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

doctrine of release, accord, satisfaction, ratification, and/or novation.

TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

If Plaintiffs suffered or sustained any damage or injury, either as 21. alleged in the Complaint or at all, the same was directly and proximately attributed to by the negligence, fraud, recklessness, carelessness, fault and unlawful conduct of Plaintiffs, and damages of Plaintiffs, if any, shall be reduced in proportion to the amount of negligence and/or fault attributed to Plaintiffs.

TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

22. If Plaintiffs suffered or sustained any damage or injury, either as alleged in the Complaint or at all, the same was directly and proximately attributed to by the negligence, fraud, recklessness, carelessness, fault and unlawful conduct of other parties or entities, whether or not parties to this action, and damages to Plaintiffs, if any, shall be reduced in proportion to the amount of negligence and/or fault attributed to such other parties or entities, whether or not parties to this action.

TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

23. Defendant alleges that the actions of Plaintiffs in concealing their claim and not requesting or indicating additional hours were worked and wages were owed during their employment are guilty of laches which precludes Plaintiffs from pursuing this action under the doctrine of laches and estoppel.

TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

24. Defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that some or all of Plaintiffs' claims have been satisfied or released.

TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' action is barred since Defendant relied in good faith in 25. conformity with and in reliance upon written guidelines, interpretations, and rules promulgated by the DLSE, Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), United States Department of Labor ("DOL"), and upon the administrative practice and

DEFENDANT JOHN W. VOJTECH'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

4

9

009318.00011/125956v1

enforcement policies of the DLSE, IWC and DOL.

TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

26. If Plaintiffs suffered any injury or damage, any alleged violation of California rules and regulations regarding minimum wage, record-keeping, and/or overtime requirements was made in good faith and Defendant had a reasonable ground for believing he was in compliance with the law.

TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

27. If it is determined that Defendant failed to perform one or more of his obligations under any contract or agreement described in the Complaint, performance of each obligation was excused due to impossibility or impracticability in each instance.

TWENTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

28. Defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that some or all of Plaintiffs' claims have been satisfied or released.

TWENTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

29. Defendant alleges that as between Plaintiffs and Defendant, the equities do not preponderate in favor of Plaintiffs, and accordingly, Plaintiffs are barred from any recovery herein.

THIRTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

30. Defendant's business practice of paying its employees is not "unlawful" or "unfair" within the meaning of <u>Business and Professions Code</u> § 17200 in that Defendant complied with all applicable statutes and regulations.

THIRTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

31. To the extent that Plaintiffs allege that one or more of Defendant's employees committed any unlawful act or omission, any such act or omission outside course and scope of employment; (2) was not condoned by this answering Defendant; (3) was undertaken without the knowledge or consent of this answering Defendant; and (4) was not the conduct of a class-based nature.

7

9

AININDON, ANDELDON, LOIA, RUUD & ROMO

THIRTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

32. Defendant overpaid Plaintiffs, and therefore would be entitled to offset by the amount of any overpayment of any sums that might be awarded in the above-entitled action to Plaintiffs.

THIRTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

33. Plaintiffs' claims for liquidated damages under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") are barred because California laws and regulations regarding such penalties violate provisions of the United States Constitution and of the California Constitution, place an unreasonable burden on interstate commerce, and constitute unequal protection and denial of due process.

THIRTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Complaint and each of its causes of action is frivolous as to 34. Defendant and Defendant is entitled to recover attorney's fees incurred in defending this action pursuant to <u>CCP</u> § 128.5, and other applicable laws.

THIRTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

35. Defendant presently has insufficient knowledge or information on which to form a belief as to whether Defendant may have additional, as yet, unstated affirmative defenses available. Defendant reserves herein the right to assert additional defenses in the event that discovery and/or further investigation or research indicates that it would be appropriate.

WHEREFORE, Defendant prays for judgment against Plaintiffs as follows:

- 1. That Plaintiffs take nothing by their Complaint;
- 2. That the Complaint be dismissed in its entirety with prejudice;
- For costs of suit incurred herein; 3.
- 4. For reasonable attorneys' fees, including but not limited to fees mandated under <u>Labor Code</u> § 218.5; and

AININDON, ANDELDON, LOTA, KUUU & KUMO

1

2

3

5. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: July 8, 2008

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO

By:

Steven D. Atkinson Mark T. Palin Christopher S. Milligan Attorneys for Defendants CBC FRAMING, INC. and JOHN VOJTECH

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Defendant demands a jury trial in this action.

DATED: July 8, 2008

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO

By:

Steven D. Atkinson Mark T. Palin Christopher S. Milligan Attorneys for Defendants CBC

FRAMING, INC. and JOHN VOJTECH

-16-

24

25

26

27

28